

21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

21st CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



Applicant Name:	Boys and Girls Club of Seymour
Proposal Ranking:	48
Average Score	95.5 / 125

Proposal Strengths:

- The needs assessment included multiple sources of data for each individual school. The evaluation plan was detailed. The applicant clearly described how the activities were evidence based and connect to the standards.
- One of the highlights was the focus on weekly staff meetings, along with assessing data from the youth workers to hear their feedback. Doing this regularly is a wonderful way to stay on track with programming and produce high quality results for the youth. Offering "town halls" for families, and finding ways to engage them was another highlight of this application. Also, the focus of specific professional development toward the SEL priority area.
- There was evidence of need through provided data in Seymour area for additional OST in the area of Academics and SEL. Partnership selections are strong and well-thought out for the program model. Professional Development selections and allocation of funds are well established. Equitable and Competitive hiring practices was an important component highlighted in the narrative as important for the organization, especially in relation to the diversity of youth they will be serving. Evaluation section was strong and well-coordinated. The amount of curriculum researched and chosen for their program was impressive and important for priority area and need for their geographic area served.

Proposal Weaknesses:

- The description of the community needs was vague and did not include sufficient data.
- With such a strong application, a focus on volunteers and discovering their in-depth knowledge to share with the program and youth would be fruitful.
- Overall, there was not enough of a passion theme in this application. It seemed sterile and formulated in several sections. Overwhelming, the applicant did not utilize data correctly. Data is a tool, therefore cannot count as narrative. If data is utilized, it needs to be supported with explanation while also referring back to the original case for support and the defined need. The applicant did not follow instructions for some areas (for example, they did not include a program implementation table) which resulted in lost points that could have benefited their overall score. As a whole, the table is useful to refer back to as a quick, high-level reference for the programs objectives, activities, performance measures and assessment strategies. Therefore, the application was a struggle to comprehend without concrete program design/implementation sections. The applicant's priority area (SEL) was highlighted well in some sections but overall there was not enough of a focus or theme throughout the application.

21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

21st CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



Top Areas Where Points Were Lost:

- Professional Development
- Partnerships
- Need for Project
- Program Design
- Program Implementation
- Safety and Transportation
- Budget